

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the application. New claim 15 is presented for consideration. Claim 3 is hereby cancelled.

Claims 1 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. The alleged problem with respect to antecedent basis has been addressed by amendment herein.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,817,263 (Taylor). Claims 4-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Taylor.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-14 and favorable consideration of new claim 15 are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Lee for the courtesies extended him during a telephone interview on February 1, 2005. During that interview, the Examiner agreed to re-open prosecution and consider claims as presented herein.

During the interview, it was agreed that claim 2 would be rewritten to avoid mixing of method and apparatus limitations.

Additionally, it was pointed out to the Examiner that Taylor does not teach or suggest the groove or tongue arrangement recited now in each of claims 1 and 2. The Examiner suggested that the functional advantage inherent to this structure be brought into the claims. Such amendment has been made.

Claims 1 and 2 are thus believed allowable. The remaining claims depend therefrom and recite further significant limitations to further distinguish over the cited art.

Entry of the amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-14 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Feb 3, 2005